UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,000	08/30/2007	Jehoshua Katzhendler	85189-9400	6881
28765 WINSTON & S	7590 05/27/201 STRAWN LLP	EXAMINER		
PATENT DEPA	ARTMENT	GUDIBANDE, SATYANARAYAN R		
1700 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1654	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/27/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@winston.com mwalker@winston.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/590,000	KATZHENDLER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	SATYANARAYANA R. GUDIBANDE	1654			
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stated any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a root will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. apply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4)	Irawn from consideration.	ection requirement.			
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · ·			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a least content of the priority documents.	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) \(\overline{\text{N}} \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)			
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1, 2, 15, 17-29 and 65-68, are drawn to a method for the preparation of a peptide-oligonucleotide conjugate (POC).

Group II, claim(s) 55 and 56, drawn to a compound represented by the structure III.

Group III, claim(s) 59-61, drawn to a side-chain protected amino acid represented by the structure I.

Group IV, claim(s) 62-64, drawn to a method for preparing a side-chain protected amino acid of structure I.

The groups of inventions listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Groups I-IV lack unity of invention because even though the inventions of these groups require the technical feature of N-α-o-nitrophenyl sulphenyl protecting group for -NH₂ group of amino acid or nucleotide, this technical feature is not a special technical feature as it does not make a contribution over the prior art in view of Zervas, 1963, Journal of the American Society, 85, 3660-3666. Zervas discloses the use of N-α-o-nitrophenyl sulphenyl

Application/Control Number: 10/590,000

Art Unit: 1654

protecting group as the N-protecting group (Abstract) during peptide synthesis. The instant

invention of group I is drawn to synthesis of peptide-oligonucleotide synthesis using the N-α-ο-

nitrophenyl sulphenyl protecting group for -NH₂ group of amino acid or nucleotide.

Election of Species

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention.

These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a

single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

N-α-o-nitrophenyl sulphenyl protecting groups

Coupling reagents of claim 2

Coupling method of claim 23

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species of N- α -o-nitrophenyl

sulphenvl protecting group and a single species of coupling agent with a chemical structure

with all the variables (if any present) clearly identified to represent a single molecule to

which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply

must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently

added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-

responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Page 3

Art Unit: 1654

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowed generic claim. Currently, the following claim(s) are generic: 1, 2, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 29, 55, 59, 62 and 65-68.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention or species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions have unity of invention (37 CFR 1.475(a)), applicant must provide reasons in support thereof. Applicant may submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. Where such evidence or admission is provided by applicant, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1654

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double

Art Unit: 1654

patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satyanarayana R. Gudibande whose telephone number is 571-272-8146. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Satyanarayana R Gudibande/ Examiner, Art Unit 1654

/Andrew D Kosar/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654